

Application No. 10/729,494
Paper Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated March 3, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 4276-050990

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached are replacement sheets 1/4, 2/4, 3/4 and 4/4 for sheets 1/3, 2/3 and 3/3 originally filed. No new figures have been added. The drawings have been properly rendered.

Changes were made to Fig. 1 adding outer cover 194 and inner cover 190 described in the specification as filed. No new matter is added. Changes were made to Fig. 3. Lower bracket 108, lower pivot 110 and lower pivot means 74 were added as described in the specification as filed. No new matter was added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended to overcome the objections thereto.

The specification and Figure 1 have been amended to overcome the objection of the double use of the numeral 86 appearing on page 9.

The objections to claim 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been carefully addressed.

Claim 7, the only independent claim remaining in the case, has been carefully amended to describe the motion conversion assembly in a way that cannot read upon what the Examiner has identified as a motion conversion means 12 in Kendrick U.S. Patent No. 1,311,127 or the motion conversion means 23 identified by the Examiner in La Jeunesse U.S. Patent No. 1,342,050.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kendrick. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment of claim 7 to more precisely set forth the motion conversion assembly clearly distinguishes Kendrick.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kendrick as applied to claims 7 and 9 above and further in view of Frigone U.S. Patent No. 902,143. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 9 clearly distinguishes claim 7 from Kendrick and nothing in Frigone suggests the modification of Kendrick to provide the motion conversion assembly as set forth in amended claim 7.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable of La Jeunesse in view of Kendrick. It is respectfully urged that amended claim 7 sets forth a motion conversion assembly which clearly distinguishes the motion conversion means 23 as disclosed in La Jeunesse and that substitution of the motion conversion means 12 of Kendrick would not provide the motion conversion assembly as set

Application No. 10/729,494
Paper Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated March 3, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 4276-050990

forth in claim 7. Claims 10, 11, and 12 are dependent on claim 7 and are allowable at least for the reason that claim 7 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is urged this case is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

David C. Hanson, Reg. No. 23,024
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1845
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-Mail: webblaw@webblaw.com